DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 572 EA 024 862

AUTHOR Guthrie, Larry F., Ed.; And Others
TITLE Institute for Interagency Collaboration: A Professional Development Conference (Phoenix, Arizona, November 5, 1992).
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 92
CONTRACT RP91002006
NOTE 42p.
AVAILABLE FROM Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA 94107-1242.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *Community Coordination; Elementary Secondary Education; Information Management; Institutional Cooperation; Parent School Relationship; *Professional Development; *School Community Relationship; *Systems Development
IDENTIFIERS *Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the meeting summarized in this report was to provide participants an opportunity to share information on their school-community collaboratives, discuss successful strategies and ways they have overcome barriers, and address significant other issues related to interagency collaboration. Fifteen school and agency administrators--representatives from 13 interagency collaboratives in Arizona, California, and Utah--participated. Following an initial role-play activity, participants engaged in a sharing/discussion period; after lunch, the group divided into work groups focused on key issues of interagency collaboration: systemic change, confidentiality, financing collaboratives, and evaluation. Included in the appendices are a participants' list, a list of background materials provided to participants, and the role-play exercise guide. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED356572

Far West
LABORATORY

Institute for Interagency Collaboration

A Professional Development Conference

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

December 1992

EA 024 862

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA 94107-1242 (415) 565-3000

This document is supported by federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, contract number RP91002006. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

INSTITUTE FOR INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

A Professional Development Conference

Editors:
Larry F. Guthrie
Bonnie L. Scott
Jo Ann Izu
Lisa Carlos

FarWest LABORATORY

Abstract

This report summarizes a professional development colloquium on interagency collaboration held November 5, 1992. The purpose of the meeting was to provide participants an opportunity to share information on their school-community collaboratives, discuss successful strategies and ways they have overcome barriers, and address significant other issues related to interagency collaboration. Fifteen school and agency administrators, representatives from 13 interagency collaboratives in Arizona, California, and Utah, participated. Following an initial role-play activity, participants engaged in a sharing/discussion period; after lunch, the group divided into work groups focused on key issues of interagency collaboration: a) systemic change; b) confidentiality; c) financing collaboratives; and d) evaluation. Included in the appendices are a participants' list, a list of background materials provided to participants, and the role-play exercise guide.

Table of Contents

Abstract i

Introduction 1

Example from the Case Study Exercise 3

General Discussion 5

Systemic Change 5

Managing Information 6

Funding Strategies 7

Evaluation 8

Appendix A: List of Participants 11

Appendix B: Background Materials. 14

Appendix C: A Role-Playing Exercise: Collaboration in a School Setting 16

- Timetable for Exercise 18
- Procedures 19
- The Special Education Instructor's Perspective 20
  - Bob Johnson's Story 20
- The Teacher's Perspective 22
  - Diane Johnson's Story 22

The Pastor's Perspective 24
Pastor Eli Hanson's Story 24
The Child Welfare Worker's Perspective 26
Marion Jones' Story 26
The Mother's Perspective 28
Jennifer Caldwell's Story 28
Individual Role Worksheet 30
Working Together: Instructions to the Moderator/Timekeeper/ Recorder 31
Moderator/Timekeeper/Recorder General Responsibilities 31
Individual Reviews of Roles 31
First Meeting 31
Second Meeting 32
Discussion Period 32
Reconvene Full Group 32
First Meeting Worksheet 33
Results from the First Meeting 33
Second Meeting Worksheet 35
Results from the Meeting with the Parent 35

Introduction

FWL had planned to organize a conference as outlined in 1990; however, it was decided that a preferable strategy for the 1992 conference would entail a shift in focus in order to address particular concerns of school administrators. One professional development focus for school administrators is to discover ways to cultivate interagency collaboration among community agencies and their schools. Therefore, FWL's Students At Risk Program convened a one-day forum on interagency collaboration on November 5, 1992. The purpose of the meeting was to provide participants an opportunity to share information on their school-community collaboratives, discuss successful strategies as well as ways in which they have overcome various barriers, and address significant issues related to interagency collaboration. In preparation for the colloquium, FWL contacted each invited participant and explored possible discussion topics. In this way, we made sure that the issues of most relevance to participants were covered.

The colloquium involved 15 school and agency administrators and staff who are working within interagency collaboratives in Arizona, California, and Utah. The meeting was organized around an initial role-play activity, followed by a sharing/discussion period; in the afternoon, participants were divided into work groups focused on key issues of interagency collaboration: a) systemic change; b) confidentiality; c) financing collaboratives; and d) evaluation/documentation. Opportunities for informal discussion and interaction were also included. The meeting was held in Phoenix, AZ and included representatives from the following collaboratives (a participants' list is in Appendix A):

- ❑ Department of Economic Security/Murphy School District; Phoenix, AZ
- ❑ Southwest Community Network; Avondale, AZ
- ❑ Project LEARN; Phoenix, AZ
- ❑ Utah State Office of Education; Salt Lake City, UT

- ❑ K-Six Early Intervention Partnership; Fresno, CA
- ❑ New Beginnings; San Diego, CA
- ❑ Coordinated Youth Services Council (CYSC); San Rafael, CA
- ❑ Early Intervention for Ensuring Student Success (EIESS); Salt Lake City, UT
- ❑ Participating Partners; Provo, UT
- ❑ Elementary At-Risk Program; Ogden, UT
- ❑ Page High School Student Services Program; Page, AZ
- ❑ The Children's Network; San Bernardino, CA
- ❑ Community Family Partnership Program; Logan, UT)

Participants were provided with background materials on each of the discussion topics, information from each of the participating collaboratives, and FWL publications on interagency collaboration. The list of background materials is in Appendix B.

For the initial activity of the institute, we engaged conference participants in *A Role-Playing Exercise: Collaboration in a School Setting*, a one and one-half hour session in which individuals play assigned roles in developing a coordinated service plan for a student who has multiple school and family problems (Appendix C). Developed by Charles Bruner of the Child and Family Policy Center, this exercise has proved to be a valuable tool for demonstrating the need for (and difficulties in) collaboration between education and agency staff when working with students and their families.

Participants were divided into groups of six, and each group received a printed set of instructions. Individuals were assigned one of six roles, each with its own description and responsibilities. The roles were: a) facilitator/ principal; b) teacher; c) special education instructor; d) pastor; e) child welfare worker; and f) mother. The role-play consisted of two sessions. In the first session (20 minutes), the mother left the room; the others discussed the family case and developed a preliminary service plan. For the second session (15

minutes), the mother returned to the group; one member described the treatment plan to her and was assisted by the group in trying to gain her approval and cooperation. At the conclusion of this session, the group members left their roles and discussed the exercise and implications. This discussion was continued when the larger group convened.

This exercise helped participants appreciate the importance of involving parents in meeting their child's educational and behavioral needs. It also demonstrated the necessity of addressing the concerns of the family, rather than just reacting to the child's presenting behavior. Finally, it showed the value of involving the greater community in providing needed support to these families. An issue that emerged in the subsequent discussion was whether the mother should have been involved in both sessions. Some participants argued that in order to understand the mother's situation fully and design an appropriate service plan, the school and agency staff needed to involve her in those discussions. Others felt her presence would not have allowed differences in opinion among professionals to surface or, if they had, might have distracted the group from helping the mother. By holding an initial meeting, they were able to air differences beforehand and thus be better prepared to present a united approach in during the second meeting. Another issue raised by the person who played the role of the mother concerned the jargon that professionals used in trying to explain how they wanted to help her. Such language would be confusing if she were someone new to the system. A final point made in the discussion was that even though the participants were experienced, they still found the exercise challenging and stimulating.

Example from the Case Study Exercise

During the planning meeting, the group spent most of its time trying to find out from each other what David's problems and home life situation were like.

Because of privacy restrictions, there was reluctance on behalf of some professionals to divulge all the information they knew. In addition, the group had to work out initial personality clashes among one other. This left less time for developing a plan of action to help David, but eventually the group suggested several strategies for dealing with identified problems. These included: a) requesting he be given a thorough psychological assessment to see if he needed an Individualized Education Plan; b) placing him in a social skills training program; c) providing him a mentor/buddy; and d) giving him a high school tutor. Also, given concerns about David's younger sister, Bonnie, it was recommended that she and David both be given a complete physical. It was felt that the family may benefit from a voluntary family maintenance program, sponsored by Child Protective Service, which brings a nurse into the home periodically. Responsibility for dealing directly with David's mother was assigned to the teacher, however noone was designated to follow through on the strategies agreed upon in the subsequent meeting.

The tenor of the second meeting was remarkably different. Where professionals had been aggressive with each other in the prior meeting, they now moved more cautiously and sensitively when addressing the mother. New information provided by David's mother about her crowded living situation changed the initial focus of strategies developed in the first meeting. Strategies for getting her into a better housing situation now took priority. For example, Section 8 housing vouchers were suggested. The severity of interventions suggested in the initial meeting–such as testing for severe mental deficiencies–were much more toned down or completely thrown out by the group.

One issue raised during this exercise concerned whether or not the mother should have been part of the initial meeting. Some in the group felt that her presence would have provided invaluable insight into the planning process.

General Discussion

Following the role-play exercise was a General Discussion in which participants described their own projects: a) the clients served; b) agencies involved; c) strategies they use; d) barriers confronted; and e) lessons learned. The session went beyond mere information-sharing as several important issues emerged. Comparisons were drawn, for example, between the informal exchange of client information in smaller, more rural collaboratives and the formal mechanisms necessary in urban contexts. Collaboratives also varied in the degree of systemic change they had accomplished–or sought. Some participants, for instance, believed that cooperation was more effective and appropriate for them than "collaboration." Differences in the basic approaches of projects, as described in our report, *School-Community Linkages in the Western Region*, were highlighted as well.

Systemic Change

A key issue at the system level is how state, federal, and local systems hinder the efforts of agencies to collaborate. The categorical structure of programs, funding and agencies erects barriers to cooperation. In the session on systemic change, the discussion centered on how each of the collaboratives tries to change the system in which they work. One suggestion, for example, was that federal and state policies and funding need to be restructured so they don't create barriers for the programs. Participants reported several ways they are attempting to change the system. One collaborative deliberately involved mid-level staff so that they can work both up and down the system hierarchy in trying to effect change. Another reported getting support and cooperation from top-level management and the front line workers, but only resistance from the middle managers.

Managing Information

The purpose of this session was to learn about the ways in which information could be shared among different agencies to maximize administrative efficiency without jeopardizing the privacy interests of clients. In particular, the group was asked to respond to four broad questions:

- ❑ What are the purposes for sharing information among agencies?
- ❑ What is your current process for sharing and managing such information?
- ❑ What are the barriers you face and what did you do to overcome them, e.g., computer security issues? *and*
- ❑ What advice would you give others who are establishing management information systems?

Members of the group described MIS systems ranging in sophistication from a single PC system, still under planning to a county-wide automated network linking data among several agencies. Verbal sharing of information was also common and occurred most frequently in case management meetings. Suggestions for insuring security of data entry and retrieval in a computerized tracking system included: a) keeping a confidentiality log of computer users; b) flagging important information without providing too much detail; and c) using passwords to restrict access to certain types of information.

Many agreed that one of the best ways to improve agency coordination is to develop common information release forms for all agencies, but it can take an inordinate amount of time to develop a form agreed upon by all participants. A suggestion for facilitating this process was first to negotiate with those agencies having the highest standard for privacy and then consider those agencies with fewer restrictions. Mental health and drug rehabilitation were cited as two fields where such restrictions were the most stringent.

When clients refuse to sign a consent form, participants said, they simply do not receive assistance; however, once clients understand the purpose of the program, they usually agree to sign.

Funding Strategies

Participants stressed that, while adequate funding is essential, the most important element of collaboration is a clear vision of what the collaboration is. Without a clear vision and strong commitment from important players, the funding will be minimal and won't last. The consensus was, "If you build a solid program, the funding will come." Because increasing amounts of funding are available for school-community collaboration, it is tempting to "go where the money is." But in doing so, the community sets up the wrong set of priorities.

The majority of the group rejected the theory that true system change through collaboration occurs only when funding streams from existing agencies are blended. Instead, they see system change resulting from a shift in mindset. Once attitudes are established which allow people to work creatively and collaboratively, system change can occur, with or without changes in funding allocation. Restructured funding is simply one possible reflection of systemic change.

Participants agreed that plenty of funding is available, and that through the process of collaborating, resources will begin to appear from places one could not have initially predicted. Private sector funding, especially corporate funding, was seen as a promising alternative during tight economic times.

One frustration aired was that most of the money provided for collaboration is still funneled into direct services. Some felt other aspects of collaboration, such as the "change process" or evaluation deserved support as well. It is

time to evaluate what works, rather than blindly pouring money into programs just because they are "collaborative." Perhaps this is an area in which private funders can make a contribution.

Evaluation

The session on evaluation focused on how participating collaboratives were evaluating their efforts. Several collaboratives had evaluation procedures in place, while others were still considering whether and how to assess their efforts. An important factor was whether or not an evaluation was required by a funding agency. Some collaboratives, for example, were required to provide an extensive set of data in accordance with guidelines established by the agencies funding their efforts (Comprehensive Child Development Program and EIESS). Others were developing their own evaluation criteria (CYSC).

A second major topic of discussion was what kind of outcome measures were appropriate. Given the complex array of services provided and the number of potential service providers, with their own record-keeping systems and procedures, determining what and how to measure is no simple matter. Some projects had developed several expected short- and long-term outcomes, but even these are difficult to interpret. Reducing the number of mothers receiving AFDC might be a long-term goal of the initiative; if the numbers increase because of increased access to services and more personalized support, is that a negative outcome? Representatives from some collaboratives had concluded that process measures such as the number of services provided were the only realistic way of evaluating what they do.

A final point raised in the discussion was that the families themselves should be involved in setting outcomes based upon their own expectations and

goals, and some collaboratives collected this information from families during intake interviews.

Appendix A

List of Participants

Jeff Wilcox
Valley of the Sun United Way
Project LEARN
1515 East Osborn Road
Phoenix, AZ 85014
(602) 631-4842

Robert Donofrio, Ed.D
Superintendent
Murphy Elementary Schools
Administrative Center
2615 West Buckeye
Phoenix, AZ 85009
(602) 484-4002

Roy Stringfellow
Assistant Principal
Page High School
P.O. Box 1927
Page, AZ 86040
(602) 645-4138

Karlene Darby
Vocational Special Needs Specialist
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 542-3450

Harold Branch
Director
Southwest Community Network
1007 South 3rd Street
Avondale, AZ 85323
(602) 932-9440

Connie Busse
New Beginnings
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street, Room 3150
San Diego, CA 92103
(619) 293-8026

Lin Barrett
Director
Coordinated Youth Services Council
2 Joseph Court
San Rafael, CA 94903
(415) 491-0708

Faith Wolfson
Coordinated Youth Services Council
2 Joseph Court
San Rafael, CA 94903
(415) 491-0708

Cedric Hardamon
K-Six Early Intervention Partnership
Fresno County Department of Social Services
L Street, 3rd Floor
Fresno, CA 93750-0001
(209) 488-1857

Sandie Oliver
Utah State Department of Human Services
Office of Social Services
120 North 200 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0500
(801) 538-4004

Jay Seese
Elementary At-Risk Program
Ogden City Schools
2444 Adams Avenue
Ogden, UT 84401
(801) 625-8742

Nancy Passaretti
Coordinator
Participating Partners
425 West Center
Provo, UT 84601
(801) 370-4608

Kent Paxton
The Children's Network
County Government Center
385 North Arrowhead Avenue
2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0121
(714) 387-8966

Kay Jacobson
Coordinator
Participating Partners
425 West Center
Provo, UT 84601
(801) 379-6655

Sebastian Striefel
Director
Community Family Partnership Program
Center for Handicapped Persons
UMC 6800
Logan, UT 84322
(801) 750-2008

Mary Ann Williams
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 538-7991

Appendix B

Background Materials

Center for the Study of Social Policy. (1991, September). *Leveraging dollars, leveraging change: Refinancing and restructuring children's services in five sites.* Washington, D.C.: Author.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Students At Risk Program. (1992). *Students At Risk Program: Publications.* San Francisco: Author.

Farrow, F. & Joe, T. (1992, Spring). Financing school-linked, integrated services. *The Future of Children*, 56-67.

Guthrie, G.P., & Guthrie, L.F. (1991, September). Streamlining interagency collaboration for youth at risk. *Educational Leadership, 49*(1), 17-22.

Guthrie, L.F. (1992). *Overview of New Beginnings evaluation.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Guthrie, L.F., & Scott, B.L. (1991). *School-community linkages in the Western Region.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Guthrie, L.F., & Scott, B.L. (1992). *Matrix of evaluation variables, subjects, and data sources.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Melaville, A.I., & Blank, M.J. (1991). *What it takes: Structuring interagency partnerships to connect children and families with comprehensive services.* Washington, D.C.: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Joining Forces, American Public Welfare Association, Center for Law and Social Policy, Council of Chief State School Officers, & Education Commission of the States. (1992, January). *Confidentiality and collaboration: Information sharing in interagency efforts.* Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Appendix C

A Role-Playing Exercise: Collaboration in a School Setting

Prepared by:
Charles Bruner
Child and Family Policy Center
November 1991

The following is a one and one-half hour role-playing exercise developed for and first used with a diverse group of educators, human service providers, and community members in one of Minneapolis' largest school districts. The occasion was a one-day meeting to explore how community organizations and schools could better collaborate to meet the needs of at-risk students. The exercise since has been used with other groups and has proved popular with participants.

The overall goals of the exercise are to help professionals and other community members:

- ❑ better appreciate the need to address all family concerns rather than focusing only on a child's presenting behavior,
- ❑ recognize the importance of involving parents in meeting a child's educational and behavior needs, and
- ❑ recognize the need to involve the greater community (churches, civic organizations, community groups) in providing needed support to families.

Persons who have participated in this role-playing exercise have felt that the roles are not unrealistic, but in fact fairly commonplace. Educators generally have felt that one or more students like David Caldwell are present in most elementary school classrooms, and participants generally feel they rarely have complete information about the family when they become involved.

This role-playing exercise may be used as a tool for illustrating, in a hands-on fashion, the need for collaboration among professional and nonprofessional support systems to successfully address many of the educational challenges facing our schools.

Child and Family Policy Center
100 Court Avenue, Suite 312
Des Moines, IA 50309

Timetable for Exercise

3 minutes	Select moderator/timekeeper/recorder Distribute roles to group members Send "mother" to "mothers' support group"
10 minutes	Read roles and responsibilities Complete worksheet on back of roles
20 minutes	Hold meeting to develop collaborative plan
15 minutes	Meet with "mother" to explain collaborative plan
15 minutes	Discuss exercise and implications

Procedures

1) Assemble participants into groups of six. Select one member to be moderator/timekeeper/recorder. Distribute five roles to other group members.
2) Send the member selected to be the "mother" out of the group to become part of a "mothers' support group" located away from the main group.
3) While the moderator/timekeeper/recorder reviews own responsibilities, other members read their roles and jot down responses to the questions on the back of their role description.
4) Commence the "3:30 p.m." meeting to discuss David's case and develop a plan of action, preparing for the "4:00 p.m." meeting with David's mother.

During this period, group members role-play their parts in preparing for their meeting with David's mother, considering the following topics: a) resources available; b) how resources can collaborate on solutions; c) development of a plan for David and his mother; d) responsibilities of each group member in carrying out actions and the time that will be devoted; and e) who will explain the plan to David's mother. The moderator/timekeeper/recorder will complete the first meeting worksheet and, where necessary, direct discussion.

5) Recognizing it is now 4:00 p.m., invite the mother into the meeting and explain the plan to her, allowing her to react.
6) As a full group, discuss the results of both meetings, with the moderator/timekeeper/recorder directing discussion based upon the second meeting worksheet and also seeking to resolve any unanswered questions from the first meeting worksheet.
7) Reconvene with other groups to discuss different experiences in conducting the exercise.

The Special Education Instructor's Perspective

[You are BOB JOHNSON, a special education instructor who has been working with David Caldwell. The principal of the school has asked you to come to a meeting with David's fourth-grade teacher and a social worker who has investigated child abuse in the family at your request. Your meeting is at 3:30, and after that discussion you will see David's mother, Jennifer Caldwell, at 4:00. You have a 4:40 appointment across town, so you hope that you will be able to leave the meeting with David's mother by 4:15 or 4:20 at the latest.]

Bob Johnson's Story

Bob Johnson is a special education instructor and has begun an evaluation of David. He believes that David Caldwell probably needs a more structured environment for learning. If David is under adult discipline and without the distractions of the classroom, he can learn quickly, provided he is given attention. Bob, in fact, likes working with David and has found that David has a good sense of humor. Still, David gets frustrated very easily, and when he does, quickly gets out of control.

Bob worries that David's home life is too chaotic and was disturbed at his second meeting with David, when he noticed a contusion on David's neck. When asked about it, David said, "Oh, my mother scraped me a little," and didn't want to talk further.

Bob has met David's mother once when she came in at his request, and Bob told her what he wanted to do to help David learn at home. She was very quiet and appeared nervous. Bob didn't have a great deal of confidence that she would carry through on the recommendations he made. She had brought her younger daughter to the meeting, and that made carrying on a

conversation difficult. He remembered that, although the daughter appeared to have a cold, she wasn't very well bundled up for the February weather.

Bob is a mandatory [child abuse] reporter. Although the contusion wasn't definitive proof of abuse, Bob decided to call the county human services office in this instance, feeling the family could probably use some counseling. There was something going on at home that wasn't helping David. Bob believes that David can catch up academically with his classmates and learn, but knows it will be tougher for him to adjust socially.

[turn over and complete the Individual Role Worksheet]

The Teacher's Perspective

[You are DIANE JOHNSON, a fourth-grade teacher with a problem student, David Caldwell. It is now 3:30, and you are getting ready to attend a meeting at the school with Bob Johnson, David's special education instructor, and Marian Jones, a Department of Human Services child welfare worker, to compare notes on the case. The principal has called you together, as each of you has contacted him about David and his family. Following the 3:30 meeting, you are going to meet with David's mother to tell her what she needs to do.]

Diane Johnson's Story

David Caldwell came into Diane Johnson's fourth-grade classroom in January, and he's been nothing but a problem since. He demands attention, mostly through acting out and often through picking fights. He makes it hard for her to teach the other 30 children in the class. Although David seems bright enough, his reading skills are at the second-grade level, and his math skills are even lower. He doesn't like not knowing the answers, which is one reason that he acts up in the class. David hasn't made any real friends during the month and a half he's been at this school. During a recent recess, David was sent to the principal for physically assaulting a second-grader. Diane sent David to the special education teacher shortly after he came into her classroom and has twice sent him to the principal. Diane has recommended that the school social worker help her out.

Diane even went so far as to contact David's fourth-grade teacher from his previous elementary school, John Ebbers, who said he'd had the same problems that she did with David and had not had much success with him. John indicated that he met David's mother, Jennifer, after finally getting her to a conference at their school. Jennifer, he claimed, seemed apathetic about

the problems the school was having with David and kept explaining all the problems she was facing in her own life. John Ebber wished Diane luck and suggested that he'd considered David's behavior disordered and was ready to recommend him for a special education class before he moved.

[turn over and complete the Individual Role Worksheet]

The Pastor's Perspective

[You are Pastor ELI HANSON, a minister for 20 years in the neighborhood where Jennifer and her two children live. The principal of Jennifer's son David's school has asked you to come to a meeting to discuss problems David has had at school.]

Pastor Eli Hanson's Story

Pastor Eli Hanson feels he knows Jennifer Caldwell only slightly. She once came to his office to talk about how she could get some support to tide her over for the month, when she first moved into the neighborhood. She seemed pleased to receive some food from the church pantry, but that did not seem to be the real reason she had come and, in fact, she talked nervously about her difficulties in keeping her life together with all her children. When he phoned her the next week, however, she seemed to be doing much better and was excited about a possible job and some new friends she had made. She came to services the next week and thanked him for his prior help.

Pastor Hanson was surprised when, shortly after this, he was contacted by Ellen Lake, the YWCA director, about Jennifer. Ellen said that she had been contacted by Marian Jones, a child welfare worker, to follow-up on Jennifer. Ellen told the Pastor that when she suggested to Jennifer that she attend parenting classes at the YWCA, Jennifer had replied that she had already spoken to her pastor about her problems and that she didn't need or have time for parenting classes.

Ellen had been asked by Marian Jones to attend a meeting at David's school. Pastor Hanson agreed that since he knew more than Ellen about Jennifer and her family, he would go to the meeting in Ellen's place, provided that Jennifer

approved. They contacted Jennifer by phone, and she seemed pleased that Pastor Hanson would be at the meeting.

[turn over and complete the Individual Role Worksheet]

The Child Welfare Worker's Perspective

[You are MARIAN JONES, a child welfare worker who has recently been assigned the case of David and Jennifer Caldwell. The principal at David's school has asked you to come in to "collaborate" with David's teacher and see what can be done to improve his school behavior and performance. Unfortunately, you left David's file in the office and weren't able to get back in time from another investigation to pick it up or look it over, but you have a general memory of the hour and a half you spent at David's home several weeks ago.]

Marian Jones' Story

Marian Jones, one of the county's child welfare workers, received a call of a suspected case of child abuse on David Caldwell from the school district and followed up within the twenty-four hour period required by law. Jennifer Caldwell didn't seem to understand why she had been called in for child abuse, although she did admit to slapping David once or twice when he had gotten "out of control." David was at home, and their interaction seemed normal. She didn't sense any particular fear from David, and, if anything, the contrary. The house was a little disheveled, which Jennifer explained was the result of moving in with a friend and lack of space. Jennifer, David, and the baby, Bonnie, all slept in the game room.

Marian didn't feel there was any serious threat in the house, and she chose to file a report on the family as one of undetermined child abuse. She had several serious cases on her hands, and this one appeared pretty stable. She could sense that Jennifer was not in very good control of her children, but also that she was not abusive with them. From what Marian could determine, there were no boyfriends who were causing problems with the children, either. Marian recommended that Jennifer seek help and parenting support

from the local YWCA and waited while Jennifer called and set up a time to see the Director. She also put Jennifer on a waiting list for counseling, which Jennifer seemed to think was a good idea. Marian thought, however, that the six-month waiting list would mean that it would be unlikely that Jennifer would ever get into counseling, unless her home situation really deteriorated.

Marian has 32 families in her caseload currently, many with serious problems that require a lot of her attention. She expects that, unless Jennifer herself calls or another report is filed against her, she will not go out to the home again but will try to call her in a few weeks to see how she is doing.

[turn over and complete the Individual Role Worksheet]

The Mother's Perspective

[You are JENNIFER CALDWELL and have been "invited" to a conference with several school and social work professionals who have been working with you or with your oldest son, David. You do not know the exact reason for the meeting, except that there has been trouble with David at school. Prior to the meeting, you wait in the hall as the "professionals" discuss something.]

Jennifer Caldwell's Story

Jennifer Caldwell, 28, is struggling to keep her household together, having moved in with her friend Sylvia in a rundown three-bedroom apartment. Jennifer's boyfriend, Max, was working out pretty well and even got along with David; but he lost his job, and they had to move from their apartment, as her AFDC check wasn't enough to pay the rent. Max is now living with his brother and looking for construction work upstate; Jennifer is not sure he'll stick around for long.

Jennifer's youngest child, Bonnie, age two, has seemingly continuous ear infections that keep her up most nights, but Jennifer has trouble getting her to a doctor and hopes she outgrows them. David seems out-of-control and won't mind Jennifer very well and recently has been having trouble at his new school. Sometimes Jennifer feels the only way to get David's attention is to slap him; she knows that's wrong, but she doesn't feel she has much of a choice. She'd like him to do better in school, but she understands why he doesn't like schools, especially having to switch around to new schools so often–four times in the last three years. Jennifer dropped out of school when she got pregnant, in the 10th grade, but even before that point she had felt out-of-touch with her classmates and doubts she would have graduated.

Mainly, Jennifer feels overwhelmed and wishes life would be a little easier. If she had time to dream about anything, it would be to work in a beauty salon or to be an actress, but both of those seem equally far off.

Lately, the school system and the social welfare system have added to her troubles. She has been called by the school principal and has gone in to see a school worker because David has been acting out. The person she talked to told her a lot of things she should be doing at home, and she nodded and was happy to hear that there was nothing really wrong. Someone from the county came by about a child abuse report, which scared her a bit, but she seemed simply to want Jennifer to talk to someone at the YWCA, who was satisfied when she told her she was talking to her pastor. She often wishes that the people she has to deal with–school administrators, welfare workers, landlords, social workers–would just listen to what she has to say and not give so many directions without understanding her life.

[turn over and complete the Individual Role Worksheet]

Individual Role Worksheet

1) Identify what you think needs to occur to improve David's behavior and school performance.

2) Identify what you think you can do to help.

3) Identify at least two obstacles that you may encounter during this process.

Working Together: Instructions to the Moderator/ Timekeeper/Recorder

This is an exercise to see how two school personnel, a social worker, and a pastor might put their heads together to help David Caldwell and his family. David has problems in school and has come into contact with several different service systems.

Moderator/Timekeeper/Recorder General Responsibilities

In this exercise, you are responsible for keeping the work on track and on time. You also will be responsible for completing the first meeting worksheet and the second meeting worksheet.

Individual Reviews of Roles

In each group, one member will become David's teacher, one his special education counselor, one his social worker, and one the pastor. The fifth will become David's mother. Each member will get a brief case summary of David from the point of view of the person they will represent.

First Meeting

After the mother is sent to a "mothers' support group," each member of the group will review their role. After 10 minutes, these four members will have their first meeting. You should explain that this meeting is to develop a plan for David and his family to share with his mother in a second meeting. You should fill out the first meeting worksheet as this discussion proceeds, and when necessary, raise questions so some of the worksheet questions can be answered. <u>The goal of this meeting is to develop a plan for David and his family</u>. Keep this meeting to 20 minutes.

Second Meeting

You are now ready for the second meeting; you should first find the mother in your group and get her to come in for the parent meeting. In this meeting, the group will explain the plan to the mother and have a discussion with her. You should let this meeting flow as it will, without trying to direct the discussion. You should, however, end this meeting after 15 minutes.

Discussion Period

You now should have a group discussion on this exercise, based at least initially in responding to the questions on the second meeting worksheet. You are the only person with a copy of these worksheets, so you will have to ask these questions to the group. In this instance, you should make some effort to direct the discussion. The time for this discussion period within the group is 15 minutes.

Reconvene Full Group

After this time, all the small exercise groups will reconvene. Unless someone else from your group volunteers, you will be expected to make a brief statement of what your group learned from this process during the full group discussion.

First Meeting Worksheet

The following are questions the small group may address in some form as they develop a plan for David and his mother during their strategy meeting. As the discussion proceeds, the moderator/timekeeper/recorder should fill in this worksheet. Some questions may not be addressed by the group, and these may be raised in the final group discussion following meeting with the parent.

Results from the First Meeting

1) What actions have been recommended, and who will be responsible for each action?

2) How many different people will be establishing plans and goals for David and his family?

3) How much time will be given to each person to work with David and his family, and will this be enough time?

4) How will actions and plans be coordinated?

5) Who, ultimately, will be responsible for making sure all the plans are carried out?

6) How much positive change is expected in David's behavior as a result of carrying out these plans?

7) How will each person be held accountable to follow through on their responsibilities under the plan?

Second Meeting Worksheet

The following are questions the moderator/timekeeper/recorder should raise following the second meeting.

Results from the Meeting with the Parent

1) How well is the plan of action developed by the initial group likely to work?

2) What changes would the group now make in the first plan?

3) What does the parent feel she needs most right now? Is the planning meeting that need?

4) Does what the parent wants or needs fit under any one organization's responsibility? Where are the most likely sources of this type of support, and what responsibility should this group take in seeing that the parent receives such support?